

**REMARKS**

**Formalities**

With this Amendment, Applicant amends Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15, and 23-27, cancels Claims 4, 10, and 14, and adds new Claims 29-38. No new matter is added. Therefore, Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15, 23-27, and 29-38 are all the claims currently pending in the present application.

IDS. Applicant notes that the Examiner has failed to consider the references cited in the September 7, 2004 IDS. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner return a duly signed and initialed PTO-Form 1149 (filed with the September 7 IDS) with the next Office communication.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-5, 8-15, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Alanara, U.S. Patent No. 6,064,880 ("Alanara"). Claims 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Cox et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,515 ("Cox"). Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Weinman, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 6,658,455 ("Weinman"). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Alanara, in view of Cox. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Alanara, in view of Cox and Fernandez et al., WO 99/65256 ("Fernandez"). Regarding these rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that no reasonable combination of the cited references teaches or suggests the presently-claimed invention.

**Claims 1, 8, 12, 23, and 27.** Regarding independent Claims 1, 8, 12, 23, and 27, Applicant submits that none of the cited references teaches or suggests at least a directory or records, wherein each record includes an indicator which indicates whether a connection to a contact is permitted.<sup>1</sup>

Alanara. Alanara is generally directed to a method of recording data in a first memory of a mobile station, transmitting the stored data to a second memory in a telecommunications network to be stored as a backup, and downloading the stored data in the second memory to the first memory in the mobile station in order to restore the contents of the first memory. (Abstract). Alanara discusses that the BMI (Base Station/Mobile Switching Center/Interworking function) of the telecommunications network makes a determination of whether the mobile station is authorized to perform a backup operation. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Alanara of any permission or non-permission of a connection of a contact to a mobile phone, and no teaching or suggestion that any of the contents of the first or second memory include any indicators indicating whether any connection is permitted.

Weinman. Like Alanara, Weinman fails to teach or suggest a directory or records, wherein each record includes an indicator which indicates whether a connection to a contact is

---

<sup>1</sup> See Claim 1: “wherein each of said records in said replica directory includes a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection to the contact is permitted;” Claim 8: “each record comprising information regarding a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection by the contact is permitted;” Claim 12: “each record comprising information regarding a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection by the contact is permitted;” Claim 23: “each record comprising data of a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a communication with the contact is permitted;” and Claim 27: “the record including a contact and an indicator indicating whether communication from the contact is permitted”.

permitted. Weinman is generally directed to a personal network directory. According to Weinman, a network server may maintain a personal network directory of a subscriber, and the subscriber may access the personal directory via a typical land-line telephone or may download the directory to a terminal memory. (Abstract). However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Weinman of determining permission for a connection or of any indicator stored in the directory indicating whether a connection with a contact is permitted.

Fernandez. Likewise, Fernandez fails to teach or suggest a directory or records, wherein each record includes an indicator which indicates whether a connection to a contact is permitted. Fernandez is generally directed to a system for delivering e-mail and voice mail notifications to a mobile phone. Fernandez does not teach or suggest determining permission for a connection or for an e-mail or any directory including records or any indicator which indicates whether a connection is permitted.

Cox. Like Alanara, Weinman, and Fernandez, Cox fails to teach or suggest a directory or records, wherein each record includes an indicator which indicates whether a connection to a contact is permitted. Cox is generally directed to a call management system for an employee-operated mobile phone which manages the use of the phone for official and unofficial uses. Cox teaches that a wireless central office may keep a database of controlled wireless telephones which may be consulted to determine if a particular wireless telephone number belongs to a controlled phone. (Col. 3, lines 5-10). A separate list may be maintained of other phone numbers to which the controlled phones are permitted to be connected. (Col. 3, lines 15-21). More specifically, Cox teaches that calls to controlled (employee) phones may be restricted by routing

these calls through a call management center. (Col. 13, lines 15-17). The call management center identifies the calling number via a MIN or ANI received through the call stream, or the caller may be asked for his number. (Col. 13, lines 20-24). Cox teaches that the separate list maintained by the call management center lists phone numbers for which calls are approved. Specifically, “is the other [calling] telephone number is listed in the controlled phone’s database record (thus indicating the number is approved by the organization), the call is completed in the normal manner.” (Col. 3, lines 11-21). In other words, the call management center maintains a list of controlled phone numbers (employee phones) for which calls are to be restricted and for each controlled phone number, a separate list is maintained of phone numbers which are *permitted* to be connected to the controlled phone. Therefore, if the calling number is included in the separate list, the call may be connected. If the calling number is not on the separate list, the calling number is not permitted. Therefore, according to Cox, there is no teaching or disclosure of any director of records including an indicator which indicates whether a connection to a contact is permitted. Further, because all the phone numbers in the separate list of Cox are allowed calls, there is no suggestion of such an indicator and it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to include such an indicator in the system of Cox because it would be redundant and would require the listing of phone numbers which are not permitted.

Therefore, in view of the above, regarding independent Claims 1, 8, 12, 23, and 27, Applicant submits that none of the cited references teaches or suggests a directory or records, wherein each record includes an indicator which indicates whether a connection to a contact is

permitted,<sup>2</sup> and therefore Claims 1, 8, 12, 23, and 27 are patentable over any reasonable combination of the cited references. Further, Applicant submits that Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 24-26 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on Claims 1, 8, 12, and 23. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15, and 23-27 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **New Claims**

With this Amendment, Applicant adds new Claims 29-38 in order more fully to cover various aspects of Applicant's invention as disclosed in the specification. No new matter is added.

Applicant submits that Claims 29-33 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on Claims 8 and 12, discussed above. Applicant submits that new independent Claim 34 is patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 8, 12, 23, and 27, and that new Claims 35-37 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on Claim 34.

Regarding new independent Claim 38, Applicant submits that any reasonable combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest at least "a communication control

---

<sup>2</sup> See Claim 1: "wherein each of said records in said replica directory includes a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection to the contact is permitted;" Claim 8: "each record comprising information regarding a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection by the contact is permitted;" Claim 12: "each record comprising information regarding a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection by the contact is permitted;" Claim 23: "each record comprising data of a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a communication with the contact is permitted;" Claim 27: "the record including a contact and an indicator indicating whether communication from the contact is permitted;" and Claim 34: "each record including a contact and an indicator which indicates whether a connection to the contact is permitted."

unit configured to refer to the replica directory to determine that a requested connection of a contact to the mobile phone is not permitted, where the contact is included in the replica directory,” as claimed.

Alanara, Weinman, and Fernandez. Regarding Alanara, Weinman, and Fernandez, as discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of these references of any determination of non-permission of a connection of a contact to a mobile phone.

Cox. Regarding Cox, as discussed above, the separate list, maintained by the call management center for each controlled phone number is a list of phone numbers with are *permitted* to be connected to the controlled phone. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion of determining that a requested connection of a contact to a mobile phone is *not* permitted, where the contact is *included* in the replica directory,” as claimed, because according to Cox, if the contact is included in the special list, the contact is permitted to be connected to the controlled phone.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicant submits that new Claims 29-38 are patentable over any reasonable combination of the cited references.

#### **Conclusion**


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

DRAFT AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/922,739

Q65752

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 18, 2005